DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 296 95 JC 780 394

AUTHOR Lombardi, John
TITLE Community Education: Threat to College Status? Topical Paper Number 68.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 78
NOTE 45p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; *Adult Education; College Credits; *College Role; Community Colleges; *Community Education; Community Services; Credit Courses; Delivery Systems; Enrollment Trends; Financial Support; *Junior Colleges; Nontraditional Students; Outreach Programs; School Community Cooperation

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the problems surrounding adult basic education, adult education, continuing education, and community services. It begins by attempting to sort out the often confusing and overlapping use of these designations by community college educators; and then presents a picture of popular community college activities. The functions, activities, and services covered by the term "community education" may be offered as degree-college-credit, non-degree-college-credit, non-college-credit, and noncredit; and as individual nonclass events varying in length. The activities may be college- or community-sponsored or may be jointly sponsored by a college and a public agency or private group. In addition, they can be held on- or off-campus, in classrooms and through media. Students and participants generally fall under the nontraditional student heading. Headcount enrollments in community education courses are usually far larger than enrollments in the degree-oriented occupational and transfer courses. The priority for state and local funding for community college courses, programs, and activities has been and will likely continue to be for credit, degree-oriented courses. Hence, there is a current trend toward making adult and continuing education, and community service activities self-supporting. (TR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156296

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMMUNITY EDUCATION: THREAT TO COLLEGE STATUS?

by

John Lombardi

Topical Paper Number 68

July 1978

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
University of California
Los Angeles 90024

JC780 394

The material in this Topical Paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the California Community and Junior College Association for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the California Community and Junior College Association or the National Institute of Education.

For information about the availability of other Topical Papers, contact the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 96 Powell Library, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024.

THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE REPRODUCED FOR FURTHER DISTRIBUTION AT WILL.

PREFACE

This Topical Paper is related to Topical Paper No. 50, Riding the Wave of New Enrollments and Topical Paper No. 54, Part-Time Faculty in Community Colleges. All three touch on the changing role of the community college in which emphasis is on lifelong learning rather than on college-credit, degree-oriented learning. This phenomenon has the potential of transforming the community college into a non-collegiate institution. The emphasis in this paper is on adult basic education, adult education, continuing education and community services. Taken together they comprise a third curriculum function of the community college. In some colleges this group enrolls more students and participants than the combined enrollment of transfer and occupational programs.

Grateful acknowledgment is extended to the authors of the many documents that I used in writing this paper and to the staff of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges for many services. The Bibliography is evidence of my indebtedness to the authors.

Keven Madvig provided me with documents from the ERIC system.

Chilaine Mitchell typed and retyped the various drafts of the manuscript and prepared the final manuscript for reproduction.

Bonnie Sanchez was responsible for the editing, compiling the Bibliography and preparing the manuscript for publication.

Arthur Cohen, Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, edited the manuscript and made suggestions for clarification and highlighting important observations and conclusions.

John Lombardi

COMMUNITY EDUCATION:
THREAT TO COLLEGE STATUS?

Adult Basic Education, Adult Education, Continuing Education, and Community Services comprise a group of functions, activities, and programs that have grown during the past ten years more rapidly than the traditional functions of transfer and occupational education. In terms of participants, the former far exceed the enrollment in the latter functions.

Definitions for each of the components of this group often vary. The technical or logical definitions propounded by professional educators are not necessarily those used by practitioners, nor are practitioners always in agreement. There is not only overlapping among the definitions but there is a considerable degree of interchangeability, i.e., a particular definition may apply to two or more of the terms.

Definitions change according to educational, statistical, financial and political considerations. For example, adult education has one meaning based on the age of the students served, another meaning based on the subject matter covered, a third definition based on the funding pattern. Or put in another way, the same course may be designated as adult education in one college, continuing education in another.

This is one of the difficulties faced by this other-than-traditional segment of the community college. Variations also prevail in terms of assessing enrollment data and allocating funds. This paper addresses those problems and differences and presents a picture of their popular community college activities.

The emergence of these functions suggests to many that the community college is entering a third era in its development. The first era was the transfer, which maintained hegemony until the late Sixties when the occupational function attained parity with it. By 1970 occupational education had passed transfer in numbers of enrollments.

The third era is characterized by a shift from the traditional occupational and transfer functions with credits, degrees and certificates, and a student body composed largely of full-time day students in the 18 to 24 year-age-group. The shift is to a broader educational group of programs in which credits, degrees, and certificates are subordinated to noncredit courses and activities. The clientele for their programs is composed almost exclusively of part-time students, participants, or spectators in all age brackets but predominantly older than the traditional college age group.

This group of functions appeared on the scene haphazardly. The traditional transfer and occupational functions were so entrenched and absorbed so much of the time and resources of the colleges that the apparently steady and slow growth of the new functions aroused little attention. In fact, their emergence to prominence seems to have taken many by surprise. Knoell, for example, wrote that "the findings and conclusion [of her study of 35,000 California students] were a shock to many who had neither an up-to-date 'feel' of the colleges nor a grasp of the cold statistics in HEGIS (the federal Higher Education General Information Survey) and other governmental reports. After all," she added, "it was thought, the universities are still highly dependent on the infusion of community college transfer students as upper division students to bolster lagging enrollments....[And] business and industry [are] eagerly awaiting the graduates of our vocational/technical programs!" (Schweinberger, 1977, Appendix F, p. 1).

Actually, the emergence of this group was not sudden nor did

it appear full-blown. Rather, it had a long gestation period dating back to the early years of the college. At least two of these components--community services and adult education--were widely accepted as functions of the community college as early as the 1930s. But at that time the functions were just being recognized as an important part of the total curriculum program. Community services were limited to a few recreational, cultural, and educational activities spread more or less evenly throughout the college year. The great majority of the courses in adult education were offered in the evening and were the same or similar to the day courses. The adult courses offered by four-year junior colleges were often below-college-level courses carried over from the high school (Bogue, 1950). That community college educators were not completely oblivious of the direction of this new development is evident in the discussions on the appropriateness of noncollege-level courses and programs in a collegiate institution and on the admissibility of those who could not profit from the traditional instructional college-level program.

One of the most serious questions in the early 1960s was what limitations, if any, should be placed on admissions. At the time it was recognized that "regardless of the extravagant statements made that junior colleges maintain an open door...and offer programs to meet all levels of ability, in practice, limits to the open door policy and to the level of courses offered are in effect in most junior colleges." Berg wrote "For far too many of the low ability students the open door leads to a blind alley" (Lombardi, 1964, p. 38).

Basic to all of this was the overriding issue confronting administrators "What is a junior college?" Does the term "college" imply primarily an institution of higher education?" "Yes," replied the faculty, and most practicing administrators, educators, and laymen. At a conference sponsored by the American Association of Junior Colleges and the Center for the Study of Higher Education of the University of California, Berkeley, a widely-representative group of junior college and university educators, labor leaders, businessmen and government

officials, agreed that "if an institution is called a two-year college, its program must be at the college level. A quality of instruction in terms of depth should be maintained even though local pressures may demand a shallower program" ("Focus on the Two-Year College," 1960, Guideline 8).

A different answer was given to this question by other educators and laymen who, according to Tillery, insisted that "the pressing demands of contemporary society cannot wait for the abilities and leadership of young men and women now in school. They would advocate a great push in adult education, not only to provide the retraining needed for employment, but to help develop knowledge and judgment about the great issues of the day" (California State Coordinating Council for Higher Education, 1965, p. 23). Gleazer, ever in the forefront of this extension of services, believed that the junior colleges should "respond to some of the special social and economic problems of urban centers, particularly unemployment and related social ills" (Lombardi, 1964, p. 52).

The original effort to modify the dominant transfer curriculum emphasis was directed toward increasing the enrollment in occupational courses and programs. However, by the 1960s occupational education was only a part of the expanded role made necessary by the tremendous sense of national involvement in education. Fred Hechinger, education editor of the New York Times, felt (correctly it turned out) that the involvement would be a lasting one and would impinge with special force upon the junior college because so many of its students came from the social and economic groups that were seeking a more favored position in American society.

President Harold B. Gores of the Educational Facilities Laboratories characterized the junior college as an academic WPA. (WPA, Works Progress Administration, was a government agency that provided jobs for the unemployed during the Great Depression of the 1930s.) According to Governor Terry Sanford of North Carolina, a junior college should be a strong advocate of education, an institution which under-

takes everything not being taken care of elsewhere. Lest there be any doubt as to what he meant, Governor Sanford enumerated activities such as education of the illiterates, uplifting of the underprivileged, retraining of the unemployed--a truly comprehensive institution. Senator Walter Stierns of California and others urged the junior college to undertake the task of preparing Americans for recreational and leisure activities, while Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, looked to the junior college for aid in solving the unemployment problem (Lombardi, 1964).

Merson, dean of instruction at Bakersfield College, summed up the new creed at the Southeastern Junior College Administrative Leadership Conference in 1964 with the far-reaching statement that the junior college should develop "a program as broad as the needs of the students enrolled [including] students [who] range from 1-99 percentile on every measure: age, personality, ability, preparation, and aspiration" (Merson, 1971, p. 5). Earlier, Blocker wrote that the community college was "dedicated to serving the educational needs of all individuals...through comprehensive curriculum guidance programs and community services" (Keim, 1976, p. 3).

What must have appeared as rhetoric in the 1960s has become reality in the 1970s. The comprehensiveness of the programs and activities embodied in these functions is spelled out in Section 132 (Scope of Lifelong Learning) of Title I of the Higher Education Act, amended 1976. Included are:

> "adult basic education, continuing education, independent study, agricultural education, business education and labor education, occupational education and job training programs, parent education, postsecondary education, preretirement and education for older and retired people, remedial education, special educational programs for groups or for individuals with special needs, and also educational activities designed to upgrade occupational and professional skills, to assist business, public agencies, and other organizations in the use or innovation and research results, and to serve family needs and personal development" (Sec 132, 20, USC 1015a).

Despite the widespread attention to community education functions, they still lack a common name comparable to "transfer" and "occupational". Moreover, the same activities may be described by different names. Consequently, this conglomerate of activities suffers from one of its principal virtues--diversity. While diversity makes for flexibility in serving a wider clientele, it does not bring the kind of satisfaction and the support obtained when working in a well-defined area with a common name that identifies the area without extended explanation.

In a position paper on community education, the Washington Council pointed to the difficulty of defining this group of activities because "nearly every educational service fits within the definition" (Community Education: Final Report, 1976, p. 2). Nevertheless, for purposes of its paper, the Council suggested "continuing education" as an umbrella term for "adult basic education, high school completion, avocational activities, specialized instructional workshops and conferences (credit and non-credit), and academic, occupational and community service offerings (in cooperation with other administrative units)" (Community Education: Final Report, 1976, p. 3).

To encompass the broad spectrum of community education, the community services council sponsored by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges changed its name in 1976 to the National Council for Community Services and Continuing Education for Community and Junior Colleges. This conforms with the 1976 amendment to Title I-Higher Education Act which substituted "community service and continuing education programs, including resource material sharing programs" for community service programs (Sec 103, 20, USC 1004).

The Community Services ACCTion Center (a consortium of 25 community colleges) interprets adult education, community education, continuing education, lifelong learning and nontraditional learning as community services (ACCTion Consortium 1977-78, [1977]), which may well be a "popular and rather grandiloquent term" (McNeil, 1977, p. 19).

Not all educators, however, seek a common term. Some either have not assumed or not desired to exercise jurisdiction over one or more

of these activities. Others, especially those in community services, fear that a common name will have deleterious effects on their specialty because the temptation to obtain credit for the community services activities will destroy their freedom to offer noncredit activities (Keim, 1976). But, as Keim points out, the movement toward a common name was too strong to resist as he and three others among more than 300 sat helplessly while the National Council for Community Services voted to become the National Council for Community Services and Continuing Education. "The effect across the nation," according to Keim, "has been to change most noncredit community services programs to credit-bearing 'continuing education' programs which are coincidentially eligible for the desired state apportionment funds" (Keim, 1976, p. 8).

Complicating the effort to find a common name to distinguish these activities from the traditional is the fact that the continuing education and adult education functions overlap with the transfer and occupational. Many of the students enrolled in the latter courses are not degree- or certificate-oriented; they are continuing or adult education students with limited personal goals.

In this paper, "community education" is used because it seems to embrace all of the functions better than any of the other terms. There is, of course, no suggestion or indication that this term will become universal. Although in its broadest interpretation community education incorporates all learning activities and services needed by the community, degree-oriented transfer and occupational courses and programs are excluded. More restrictive is the Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory definition of community education enrollment "as the total number of people participating in noncredit activities sponsored by a college," (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976, p. 3), and "service, recreational, and cultural programs that are not part of an academic program" (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978, p. 2).

Notwithstanding the lack of a common name most colleges want responsibility for all of these activities and programs. Typical of the educa-

tors' attitude is the action of a Task Force of the California Community and Junior College Association recommending that "all publicly supported, noncredit, postsecondary education now provided both in community colleges and in secondary schools should be the responsibility of the community colleges." In the article announcing this recommendation, "noncredit continuing education" and "noncredit adult education" were used interchangeably with "noncredit postsecondary education" ("Community Colleges Should Have Sole Delivery Responsibility Task Force Says," 1976, p. 6). The Task Force declared that "noncredit adult and continuing education... should include basic education, vocational education, personal competency skills, and avocational education." It also stated, probably in response to criticism about some offerings, that "no further distinction should be made, since such distinctions are based upon assumptions about courses, communities, and individuals which cannot be supported" ("Community Colleges Should Have Sole Delivery Responsibility Task Force Says," 1976, p. 6). The recommendation does not include community services since it embraces more than the formal classroom, education activities implied in the noncredit postsecondary education, since California state law requires that public education institutions make their facilities available to community groups, and since the law also permits colleges to offer at local expense other services and activities. Otherwise the report is broad enough to include all other areas.

An Illinois study, "A Comparison of Participant's Responses Concerning Their Perceptions of the Importance of Community Needs and Philosophy in Relation to the Community in the Community College," is similar in many respects. It reported that:

"1. All groups of students and/or participants from all socio-economic segments...should be served by the community colleges and financial resources required should be provided....

2. All students can benefit intellectually from a college education and community colleges would better serve the needs of most socially disadvantaged than four-year colleges and universities.

3. Courses, services and centers should expand remedial programs

to be relevant to the disadvantaged without diluting the pursuit of intellectual truth by provision of services to the larger community" (Schweinberger, 1977, p. 21).

The transfer of jurisdiction over adult education functions from the secondary school to the community colleges is proceeding throughout the country, but at an uneven pace. In Iowa, for example, the transfer is well advanced with the growth of the area school concept that emerged as a result of Title VIII of the National Defense Act of 1958 which provided matching funds for the development of area vocational programs. As a consequence the 13 area community colleges and 2 area vocational-technical schools have responsibility for public postsecondary programs (Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, [1976]). A similar development is taking place in Florida where, through agreements with the local county district boards, 13 community colleges have been given responsibility "for elementary and high school courses for adults 16 years of age and older and who have legally left the regular day school" (Florida State Department of Education, 1977, p. 22).

Although a limited number of California community colleges have exclusive jurisdiction over adult education and others offer some adult education courses, the function is still largely under the jurisdiction of the secondary school. The situation in Illinois resembles that in California. Some college districts, Chicago, for example, have been given responsibility for adult education in the city. Others share it with the secondary school.

To summarize, the functions, activities, and services covered by community education may be grouped broadly under adult basic education, adult education, community services, and continuing education. Services may be offered in classes as degree-college-credit, non-degree-college-credit, non-college-credit, and noncredit; as individual nonclass events varying in length from one hour to several days, a weekend, or spread over a period of time. The courses, services, activities may be college-sponsored, community-sponsored using college facilities, or jointly sponsored by college and public

agency or private community group.

Services may be held on-campus, off-campus, in classrooms and through media--telephone, radio, television, newspaper, computer. The students and participants are oriented toward personal goals, usually short-term, do not have degree or certificate objectives, are older than traditional students, ranging in age from infants to senior citizens and from illiterates to university graduates, and attend intermittently or on a part-time basis.

ENROLLMENTS

Enrollment statistics for community education activities are difficult to gather, primarily because these activities are not standardized or classified uniformly. In some states they may be classified as degree-credit-classes, in others, as non-degree-credit courses; many activities, especially those under community services, are not organized as classes. The difficulty is compounded by the fact that adult basic education and adult education functions are still largely reserved for the secondary schools, although most colleges offer such courses under other names--developmental, opportunity, nontraditional--for essentially below-college-level or non-degree college level courses.

Continuing education enrollment is the most elusive. Very few colleges report enrollment under this classification; yet, by definition, many students reported as enrolled in college-credit-courses are continuing education students--those with short-range objectives or those who already possess a degree. Most of these students attend in the evening where they comprise the largest proportion of the enrollment. A large number also attend during the day.

Community services statistics are the most intractable, including a great deal of guesswork. Moreover, it is difficult to determine the number of participants, especially where the college's facilities are used by community groups. Very few states report participants in all community services activities and programs.

As a result of these difficulties, the enrollments and/or participants reported under community education are understated. The premium on degree-credit-classes in the funding patterns, the importance of credentialling to students, and the prestige of college education act as incentives for classifying as many classes as possible as degree-credit classes.

Indeed, if college-credit class enrollments were broken down into degree-college credit class enrollment and non-degree college credit class enrollment, the latter, plus the adult, adult basic credit,

and continuing education enrollments and the community services activities would far exceed the combined enrollment of the traditional transfer and occupational enrollment.

National Enrollment

Although recent national statistics include community education activities, the situation is far from satisfactory. An explanatory note in the 1978 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory, published by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), points up the two most serious weaknesses in this area: 1.) "there are no clearly defined registration periods" and 2.) "data on this type of participation may not be routinely collected by some institutions" (1978, p. 2). A third is there are no such clearly defined classifications as transfer or occupational.

In the AACJC Directory two broad categories are used: "Enrollment...[which] includes only those students enrolled for courses or programs for credit, usually toward an associate degree or certificate" and the other "Community Education Enrollment...[which includes] participation in service, recreational, and cultural programs that are not part of an academic program" (1978, p. 2). The major emphasis is on the former which is broken down under Full-Time, Part-Time and Total. The latter is allotted one column.

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), divides credit-enrollment into bachelor's-degree-credit, non-bachelor's-degree-credit, and unclassified; those who are not candidates for a degree or other formal award but who take courses in regular classes with other students or who cannot be classified by academic level; and those who already have a degree. The NCES statistics do not include students who are in: noncredit courses, taking courses at home or in extension centers, enrolled only for short courses or attending credit courses as auditors (Wade and Others, 1977). Thus they fall below other figures.

The difficulty of gathering community education statistics is exemplified by the experience of the editor of the 1976 Community,

Junior, and Technical College Directory who commented that the 1.34 million participants in noncredit activities reported for October 1975 "probably does not cover the total picture" (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976, p. 3). In 1977 the number reported for the full year 1975-76 rose to 3.2 million (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1977, p. 96). The number dropped for 1976-77 to 2.80 million--a decline that does not, the editor felt, "represent a decline in community education participation, but...a lack of institutional data in this area" (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978, pp. 2-3).

The NCES reports indicate that the non-bachelor's-degree-credit (continuing education) enrollment between 1973 and 1975 increased at a moderately higher rate than the bachelor's-degree-credit enrollment. During this three year period the former rose from 1.02 million to 1.39 million for a 36 percent rise, while the latter rose from 2.01 million to 2.6 million for a 29 percent increase (Wade and Others, 1977). The total enrollment for continuing education and noncredit adult programs in 1975 exceeded four million.

The NCES continuing education and noncredit adult enrollment statistics for 1975-76, divided into two large categories of 31 "Academic Subjects" and 6 "Occupational Specialties," show how closely these subjects and specialties resemble college-credit transfer and occupational courses and programs. In Table 1A to 1D are listed 10 of the 32 academic subjects and all (except "Other Technologies") of the occupational specialties. Among the other academic subjects are communications, engineering, foreign languages, mathematics and social sciences.

The four tables contain the subjects and specialties, with the highest and the lowest registrations and the percentage each subject or specialty bears to the total registrations in the group.

TABLE 1
ENROLLMENT IN CONTINUING EDUCATION AND
NONCREDIT ADULT PROGRAMS 1975-76

A. Academic Subjects With The Largest Registrations	N	% of All Academic Subjects
1. Physical education and avocational instruction	614,462	20%
2. Fine and applied arts	443,576	14%
3. Home economics	392,857	13%
4. Developmental activities	307,635	10%
5. Interdisciplinary studies	232,435	8%
Sub-Total	1,990,965	65%
Total all academic subjects	3,071,883	100%

B. Academic Subjects With The Lowest Registrations	N	% of All Academic Subjects
1. Military sciences	1,156	<1%
2. Library science	2,286	<1%
3. Computer and information sciences	2,941	<1%
4. Theology	10,721	<1%
5. Agriculture and environmental design	11,646	<1%
Total	28,750	1%
Total all academic subjects	3,063,883	100%

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

C. Occupational Specialties With The Largest Registrations	N	% of All Occupational Specialties
1. Business and commerce technologies	292,162	26%
2. Mechanical and engineering technologies	270,378	24%
3. Health services and paramedical technologies	227,411	21%
Total	789,951	71%
Total all Occupational Specialties	1,106,142	100%

D. Occupational Specialties With The Lowest Registrations	N	% of All Occupational Specialties
1. Data processing technologies	10,17[illegible]	1%
2. Natural service technologies	122,656	11%
3. Public-service-related technologies	182,515	17%
Sub-Total	315,342	29%
Total all occupational specialities	1,106,142	100%

Source: "Enrollment in Continuing Education and Noncredit Adult Programs in 1975-76," 1978, p. 10.

STATE DATA ON COMMUNITY EDUCATION ENROLLMENT

The state enrollments for California, Florida, Illinois, Iowa and Oregon are intended to give a picture of the extent to which community education is progressing. They are not for comparisons among the states. Unless otherwise stated, the enrollments are headcount. Because many community education activities are of short duration, have continuous or frequent enrollment, and are not equated in credits, the enrollment statistics are likely to be for the full year rather than for the fall opening enrollment. Also, headcount enrollment for community education may include a great deal more duplicate enrollment or participation (the same individual counted two or more times) than headcount enrollment for the regular functions.

Moreover, there is no full-time equivalent enrollment for the community services or for much of the non-college credit continuing education activities except where a continuing education unit (CEU) equal to 10 attendance hours per week has been adopted. This is not comparable to the credit hour, roughly equal to 15 class hours per week. Except for California and a few other states data on community services participation in nonclass activities are meager. Where available, full-time equivalent enrollments are used to give a perspective on the relation of headcount to full-time equivalent enrollment for community education and for the traditional transfer and occupational classes.

California

California enrollment statistics are reported as "credit" and "adult". For the Fall 1976 the total for the two categories was approximately 1,258,000, of which 183,000 was adult education enrollment. The small number of adults reported reflects both the continued predominance of the secondary schools in adult education and the college's tendencies to classify as many courses as possible as credit rather than as adult, because credit classes receive higher state support than adult. Of the 70 college districts, 17 reported no

adult education enrollment for Fall 1976 and 28 reported less than 10 percent. On the other hand, three districts that had jurisdiction over adult education reported more than 50 percent of their enrollment as adult (California Community Colleges, 1978).

California community colleges would like to take over control of adult education but the opposition of secondary school administrators, especially in Los Angeles, has been too strong to overcome. In fact, one or two secondary school districts are trying to regain control of the adult education function transferred to the community colleges. However, California colleges that do not have jurisdiction over adult education offer noncredit adult education classes under community services auspices, but these classes receive little or no state support. Major funding comes from a permissive local property tax and student fees.

A large proportion of students enrolled in credit classes, particularly "the part-time, older students come with their own objectives...which often are achieved outside degree and certificate programs. They tend to enroll on an intermittent basis" (Knoell and Others, 1976, p. i) as continuing education students. A second group classified as college credit students is comprised of students enrolled in remedial or developmental classes. In some states these classes are classified as adult education or adult basic education.

These two groups represent a very large proportion of the college credit enrollment. Knoell concluded that "continuing education for part-time, adult students has become the dominant function of the Community Colleges" (Knoell and Others, 1976, p. i). Conservatively, community education enrollment, excluding community services participants, represents at least 60 percent of the one and a quarter million enrollment reported for Fall 1976.

The small official enrollment in adult education is in contrast to the enormous enrollment in community service classes and participation in other community services activities. In a survey of enrollees and participants in community services, 85 California colleges reported

that 192,500 were served in more than 5,600 classes and almost one and a quarter million participants were served by nonclass activities. An additional 357,000 were served by community development and major community outreach projects. The total served by these classes and projects was just short of 2 million (1,790,000). This compared with 1.4 million enrolled in the state-supported college classes (Brossman, 1976).

But this is only a fraction of the 13.2 million served through 36 additional services that range from child care (3,186) to public information (7,336,890). Other areas serving more than a million were radio/TV programming (1,020,150) and community recreation programs (1,282,964) (Brossman, 1976). In the light of these numbers it is not surprising that the "143,000 persons [who] enrolled in or attended community services activities at Cabrillo College [California] or in an off-campus location" represented 1.003 times the population of the county (Welch, 1976, p. 38). If all of the 103 colleges in the state had reported data, the total would also have approached the state population of 20 million (Brossman, 1976).

Florida

In addition to the normal functions of college transfer, vocational-technical, and postsecondary adult/continuing education, some Florida colleges by agreement with local county school boards "have major responsibilities for elementary and high school courses for adults 16 years of age and older and who have legally left the regular day school, English as a second language and courses for adults preparing for the General Education Development Tests leading to a Florida High School Equivalency Diploma" (Florida State Department of Education, 1977, p. 22).

The course offerings in continuing/adult education are classified as: Developmental, including compensatory and adult; Community Instructional Services, including citizenship and avocational; and Other Personal Objectives. A fourth area is Vocational-Supplemental and Apprenticeship "designed to enable the student to upgrade his

skills in an area in which he may already be employed" (Florida State Department of Education, 1977, p. 39). In the first three categories during 1975-76 almost 203,000 students were served. Another 84,000 students were enrolled in Supplemental and Apprenticeship courses. Together these students represented 57 percent of the annual unduplicated headcount enrollment of 504,000 (Florida State Department of Education, 1977).

These figures do not include those students enrolled in Advanced and Professional and Occupational programs who did not intend to obtain an associate degree. As in other states a large majority of the part-time students enrolled in the regular credit classes are in fact continuing or adult education by goal. In the fall of 1975 there were almost 72,000 part-time students or 47 percent of the 153,000 enrolled in the college credit courses (Florida State Department of Education, 1977).

Illinois

The non-baccalaureate-oriented and non-career-occupational programs in Illinois are classified as:

1. General Studies: preparatory or developmental instruction, adult basic education and general education designed to meet individual educational goals.
2. Community Education: non-credit adult continuing education classes, designed to meet individual educational goals.
3. Community Service Activities: workshops, seminars, forums, cultural enrichment, community surveys, facility usage, and studies designed to meet community service needs (Illinois Community College Board, 1978b, p. 3).

For the Fall of 1977, out of a total of 534,000 enrollments and participants, 69,100 students were in general studies credit classes and 53,000 students in non-credit classes. Participants in community services non-credit nonclassroom offerings were estimated at 147,000. The combined general studies, and the non-credit enrollment and participants, totalled 269,100. The total credit class enrollment

in baccalaureate-oriented and career-occupational credit enrollment was 230,300. Not included in these statistics are 34,300 Undeclared credit students (Illinois Community College Board, 1978c).

Also pertinent to the analysis of the growth of community education is the high proportion, 71 percent, of part-time credit enrollment, which according to Knoell's findings for California, pursue continuing education goals rather than degree-oriented goals (Illinois Community College Board, 1978b). The enrollment of General Studies and participants in Community Education made impressive growths from 1973 to 1975 but since 1975 the General Studies enrollment has declined from 89,800 to 69,100 in 1977 and the Community Education Service participants have stabilized at 200,000 (Illinois Community College Board, 1978c).

Iowa

Iowa statistics are in three major categories--Adult Education, College Parallel and Career Programs. The Adult Education is broken down into eight classifications, shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
IOWA ADULT EDUCATION CLASSIFICATIONS
AND ENROLLMENTS 1976-77

Classification	Headcount	FTEE*
High School Completion (federally funded)	Not Available	2,632
T.V. High School	"	63
High School Completion (non-federally funded)	"	903
Adult General Education	"	704
Avocational and Recreational	"	806
Course for Drinking Drivers	"	40
Career Education Programs	"	6,760
College Parallel Programs	"	200
	360,867	12,109

*1 FTEE = 540 attendance hours

Source: Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, [1976], pp. 13-14.

The headcount enrollment of the Adult Education programs for 1975-76 was 360,867 or 84 percent of total enrollment of 418,400; but, when converted to FTEE the percentage drops to 28, still higher than the 24 percent of College Parallel but much lower than the 48 percent of Career Programs (Table 3).

Table 3 shows that headcount enrollment to FTEE enrollment for Adult Education Classes was 30 to 1, in contrast to 9.6 to 1 for total enrollment and 2.2 to 1 for College Parallel and 1.6 to 1 for Career Programs. Roughly it takes 30 students in Adult Education to generate one FTEE, slightly more than two in College Parallel, less than two in Career Programs. This is a characteristic of community education enrollment that is composed predominantly of part-time students, although the 30 to 1 Iowa ratio for adult education is higher than in most states. (See Table 4 for the Oregon ratio.)

Iowa colleges also offer "community services structured to meet the needs of the individual merged areas" (Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, [1976], p. 10). The class activities are included under the avocational and recreational subclassification. Data on participants in the nonclass activities are not reported.

TABLE 3
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN HEADCOUNT AND FTEE
IOWA AREA SCHOOLS
1975-76

	Adult Education	%	College Parallel	%	Career Program	%	Total
Headcount	360,867	84	23,372	6	34,168	8	418,407
FTEE	12,109	28	10,584	24	21,081	48	43,774
Headcount per FTEE	30 to 1	--	2.2 to 1	--	1.6 to 1	--	9.6 to 1

Source: Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, [1976], p. 13.

In this state, the regular transfer and occupational programs are classified as Lower Division Collegiate and Vocational Preparatory.

Community education programs are classified as:

1. Vocational Education/Supplementary
2. Other Reimbursable (self-improvement or complementary courses to other approved courses/programs)
3. Nor-Reimbursable (hobby courses or courses not approved for state and/or Federal Funds)
4. Separate Contract (courses for which the majority of the cost is paid by private, federal or other state agencies)

The data for Oregon are contained in Table 4. For the year 1975-76 the unduplicated headcount enrollment of the four classifications that are grouped as community education was higher than that of the degree and certificate programs, 121,500 to 80,200 in round numbers. But, as elsewhere, the full-time equivalent enrollment of the Lower Division Collegiate and Vocational Preparatory programs was more than three times that of the continuing/adult education programs. Also, in conformity with the general trend was the higher proportion of women to men in the community education programs in contrast to the higher proportion of men in the degree programs.

TABLE 4
OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGES
UNDUPLICATED HEADCOUNT AND FTE ENROLLMENTS
1975-76

Instructional Programs	Headcount[1]			FTE[2]	Headcount to FTE
	Total	Male	Female		
Vocational Education Supplementary	32,530	19,267	13,263	3,056	10.6 to 1
Other Reimbursable	54,889	19,614	35,275	5,929	9.3 to 1
Non-Reimbursable and Separate					
Contract	34,102	10,693	23,409	2,942	11.6 to 1
Subtotal 1	121,521	49,574	71,947	11,927	10.2 to 1
Percent	100	41	59	24	
Lower Division Collegiate	40,760	20,403	20,357	18,855	2.2 to 1
Vocational Preparatory	39,489	23,644	15,845	19,067	2.1 to 1
Subtotal 2	80,249	44,047	36,202	37,922	
Percent	100	55	45	76	
Grand Total--Subtotal 1 and 2	201,770	93,621	108,149	49,849	4.0 to 1
Percent	100	46	54	100	

Source: [1]Oregon State Department of Education, Table III, 1977.
[2]Oregon State Department of Education, Table VI, 1977.

The Vocabulary Supplementary, Other Reimbursable and Non-Reimbursable and Separate Contract FTE enrollment increased by 70 percent during the 1971-72 to 1975-76 period while the combined Lower Division Collegiate and Vocational Preparatory increased by 45 percent (Oregon State Department of Education, 1977).

Summary

Headcount enrollments in community education courses are usually multiples of the enrollments in the degree-oriented occupational and transfer courses. On the other hand, the reverse is true for full-time equivalent enrollments.

Data for continuing education/adult education students enrolled in degree-credit classes are not available. Data are not readily available for non-class activities, but there are many participants in community service activities.

FUNDING

Funding varies for different components of community education. In general, these programs tend to be funded at a lower rate than the college transfer and occupational programs. Some receive no funding, with all expenses borne by students, participants or contracting agency; others receive no state funds but may receive local and/or federal funds and student fees. Some are funded by lump sum allocations; others by enrollment formulas that are sometimes lower than the enrollment formulas for the regular college credit classes. A few receive the same allocation of funds as the regular credit classes. Approved activities that can be organized as regular college courses are usually funded at the same rate as the regular courses. The activities that receive the lowest allocation of state funds are those related to community services or those that inure to the benefit of a particular agency, business, or industry. Of the many types of activities in this group, funding for the recreational, hobby, and avocational activities is the most difficult to get.

Because of these differences in funding, educators occasionally are tempted to manipulate courses by classifying them in the category that brings the most favorable return. That is, community services activities are transformed into adult education classes and adult education classes are organized as college-credit classes.

Although the community services activities and classes receive the most criticism, the whole concept of public support for community education activities has been questioned. Criticism goes beyond the "frills and entertainment courses" (Watkins, 1978a, p. 1). Some are asking: "Should the taxpayer pay ever increasing taxes to provide socially acceptable leisure time activities for some citizens?" (Cutting, 1978, p. 6). Others wonder if the desire to provide every conceivable need of the individual should be the responsibility of the community college. The practice of taking over an educational function that is already being provided by a public agency--e.g.,

police department, fire department, correctional institution--is also questioned since this leads to duplication of appropriations of educational funds (McNeil, 1977).

The multiplicity of classifications used in enrollment reports reflects the state concern over the kinds of services to be funded. While legislators have been fairly liberal in increasing state allocations, they have been unenthusiastic about the efforts to expand the functions to embrace all community education.

Advocates of community services, the group most attacked, are the most discouraged regarding funding. Based on a survey of funding patterns in the seven pacesetter states of California, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Texas and Washington, Evans came to the conclusion that:

> "It is all too obvious that, despite the great strides made in community services in the last five years and the greater awareness generated by the AACJC Community Services Project and the National Council on Community Services, the battle for full acceptance of the community services dimension is far from won. The lack of certainty of funding is indicative of the continuing need to justify the existence of community services and to be resourceful in obtaining funds" (1973, p. 6).

In these seven states, fees charged participants accounted for about 5.5 percent of community services funds in California, 23 percent in Florida and Illinois, 44 percent in Michigan, 53 percent in New York, 74 percent in Texas and 91 percent in Washington (Evans, 1973). Since the survey the percentages have gone up in California and Florida. In Washington community services must be self-supporting.

Responses to a questionnaire sent to 23 state directors of community college systems during the Fall 1976 by Roed revealed that for community services in 10 states no state funding was provided; in eight only partial funding was provided. Local funding through a property or sales and service tax was the source of funds in five

states, participants fees provided partial or total funding in six states. No local funding was available in six states. Roed concluded that there was a decrease of state support for community services (Roed, [1976]).

The principle involved in the distinction between public funding or no public funding has already been alluded to in discussing the Florida practice. Public funds are allocated for programs "designed to improve the quality of community life and to assist in the identification and solution of community problems" but are denied to avocational and non-vocational courses which "are designed primarily to satisfy the personal objectives of the participants." The one provides "specific social benefits," the other satisfies "personal needs of individuals" (Florida State Department of Education, 1977, pp. 90-91).

Educators have not convinced either the state legislators or the public that community services is as important to the college as are the traditional college credit programs. The concept of a college as a learning institution with the traditional trappings of students, faculty, credit courses, degrees, and certificates is too strong to be shunted aside or equated with services and offerings that seem designed to entertain rather than educate. Hence it is fairly certain that public funding will continue to be provided for adult basic education, adult education and continuing education--even though much of the educational offerings are below-college-level--provided the programs are educational. The more traditional, the better.

Some states fund the programs at the same rate as the transfer and occupational ones, especially if, as in California, the developmental and adult basic education programs are accepted parts of the college-credit programs. Others show different patterns.

- In Florida (which provides state funding minus tuition) the cost per FTE in 1975-76 for programs funded in Developmental, ($1,279) and Community Instructional Service ($1,340) were higher than the cost for Advanced and Professional ($1,250) and lower than

the cost for Occupational ($1,465). As we mentioned before the Community Instructional Service recreational and leisure time courses must be self-supporting (Florida State Department of Education, 1977).

- During 1975-76 Illinois in Public Service Grants a total of $705,000 down from $750,000 during each of the previous three years. In 1976-77 and for 1977-78 no Public Service Grants were provided (Illinois Community College Board, 1978c). As a substitute colleges were permitted to use one cent of the property tax for this purpose. For General Studies the state provides about $7 per credit hour compared to the state average of $19 for all credit courses (Illinois Community College Board, 1978a).

- Iowa reimburses colleges for all approved programs at a uniform rate based on a full-time equivalent enrollment (FTEE) of 540 reimbursable hours. Enrollments generated by non-Iowa residents, students in continuing and general adult education courses and programs fully-funded from outside sources such as federal programs are not eligible for state aid. Of the 43,774 FTEE in 1975-76 about 10 percent or 4,330 were not reimbursed by the state (Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, [1976]).

- Oregon's Other Reimbursable operating cost per FTE in 1975-76 was ($1,459) about 98% of the operating cost of Lower Division Collegiate ($1,477) and Vocational Education ($1,483). (The state provided approximately 46 percent of the funds for reimbursable operating costs.) (Oregon State Department of Education, 1977). The Non-Reimbursable and Separate Contract Courses received no state funds. Oregon's "separate contract" category is an example of a growing practice to require a business, industry or other private agency to pay for services provided exclusively for their employees. The development of the continuing education unit (CEU) was designed in part to help colleges price their services.

It is noteworthy that the leaders of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and others are also acknowledging that public resistance to expansion of educational services is

growing. Gleazer, in an address to the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems in 1976, wondered whether the goal that "every individual shall have opportunity for appropriate education up to the limits of his or her potential" is realistic today (1976, p. 11). To the question: "Are there any limits to the amount of resources allocated to this goal?", he answered that "a kind of riptide exists between the interest in lifelong education and the apparently limited financial resources available for conventional education for traditional students" (1976, p. 6). "The question," according to the Washington State Advisory Council on Community College Planning, "is not one of adequate demand but how much of that demand can be served and by whom" (Community Education: Final Report, 1976, p. 8).

Cutting, program budget manager for the California Department of Finance, told a group of college presidents in January of 1978 that the historical concept that revenues would always meet the demand for services "has been questioned concerning the nature of different demands." He warned that if the legislators or the voters approve property tax relief proposals, revenue growth controls that are likely to be included "will require local boards to make hard choices concerning the types of programs offered" (1978, pp. 7-8).

The funding patterns for community education will become even more precarious if inflationary pressures increase and the "revolt" against higher taxes leads to cuts in public expenditures. Voter approval of the Jarvis-Gann initiative (Proposition 13) to limit property taxes to one percent of the assessed valuation is resulting in a reduction of support for all California public services and may be disastrous for adult education, continuing education, and community services activities. These programs are likely to be curtailed or made self-supporting. The no-tuition policy for the traditional transfer and occupational courses is also in jeopardy (Watkins, 1978b).

In summary the priority for state and local funding for community

college courses, programs, activities is and is likely to continue to be: credit, degree oriented education; adult basic education; adult education; continuing education; and community services. The trend is toward making adult and continuing education as well as community services courses, programs, and activities self-supporting, with remission of tuition and fees for disadvantaged, handicapped, and senior citizens.

CONCLUSION

Opinions on the value of community education functions vary from those that see them as the foundation of a new kind of institution in which the college-orientation will be subordinated to the community-orientation to those that see them as a debasement of the higher education status of the community college. The former view considers these functions as part of the evolutionary process that takes place in a dynamic institution that has been on the periphery of the educational hierarchy, an alternative to the career-ladder configuration of elementary school, high school, college, university. Such a view holds that the change has not been designed for some ulterior purpose for example, as an educational opiate for the masses, as a way to divert the institution from creating an effective lower division program for the masses that might challenge the elitist character of the senior institutions, or to divert attention from the institution's lackluster performance in achieving upward mobility. In offering these activities, practicing educators see no challenge to the collegiate-orientation. They consider them to be the continuation of the expansion of functions--transfer, occupational, community education--and the broadening of the student base, starting with the children of the middle class and expanding it to include the children of the minorities, the poor, the physically and mentally disadvantaged.

Unabashedly many educators look upon these activities as a counterpoise to the declining enrollment growth in the traditional college-credit courses and programs. They accept the exhortations of their professional leaders to adopt business practices of selling, marketing, and merchandising their products as a means of increasing enrollment and developing new products and processes in order to avoid the fate of once prosperous industries that failed to adapt to changing conditions.

Their goal of serving Everyman and Everywoman is closer to

reality, so much so that quite a few educators are looking toward the day when the community college will be transformed into "a new kind of college--standing between the high school and the university--offering broad programs of experiences of value in and of themselves, neither post high school as such or precollege as such" (Gleazer, 1964, p. 49), an idea that was expounded by Gleazer as early as 1964 and kept in the forefront by him and others ever since. In 1974 Gleazer told a group of community service professionals: "You are the community college of this [new] era--the community college now being shaped and formed--one to match as well as to influence the times" (Yarrington, 1976, p. 21). In the same year Pifer of the Carnegie Corporation echoed Gleazer when he urged the colleges to "consider themselves primarily as community service agencies rather than institutions of higher education" (Talbott, 1976, p. 84).

The prospect that this group of functions will become dominant cannot be overlooked. Perhaps at some time during the next several decades the college may be transmuted into a new institution, as Gleazer and others are predicting. As one observes this movement one cannot but be impressed by its sweep across the country, by the zeal of its adherents, and by the fervor of their claims of its benefits to society and the individual.

Community college educators exhibit a mild form of schizophrenia. On the one hand, they strive to achieve higher status for their institution, as do educators in other segments. On the other hand, in assuming such functions as adult basic education, remediation, and adult education, they attract low aptitude and functional illiterates, thereby lowering the status of the institution by bringing it closer to the high school from which they have been attempting to create a wide chasm. Bowen calls the latter a "double selection process" through which "some congruity is achieved between the characteristics of institutions and the characteristics of their students." More serious is the "stratification...according to social class and academic ability" this process brings about (Bowen, 1977, pp. 15-16).

There are, of course, critics who see this development in a different light, who see community education as a threat to collegiality, the debasement of the community college into an institution even less intellectual than the "glorified" high school that critics used to call the junior college. They view with disdain the activities that seem far removed from education. "Frills and entertainment courses" (Watkins, 1978a), "avocational and recreational courses" (Owen, 1978), and "crafts for fun, bridge playing, car mechanics, upholstery" (McNeil, 1977) are targets of critics, state officials and legislators.

Within the walls, "many presidents, deans, other administrators, and faculty frequently regard the program of community services as secondary, an amplification of the standard functions, not as a separate function" (Harlacher, 1969, p. 42). Wygal attributes the slow past growth due to the perception of community services "as doing something on the side for the local folk while the college was getting on with the real business of the formal education of America's youth" (Solomon, 1976, p. 43).

Resistance to remedial and developmental education is widespread among the faculty, often forcing administrators to set up a separate department with special instructors in order to teach the courses. Legislators and state officials are becoming more resistant to the concept that society must provide for every conceivable educational need at public expense. They are wary of educators who assert that there should be no limit to the services and activities that should be offered (Cutting, 1978).

Community college educators are also confronted with the charge that community education is embraced enthusiastically because it may somehow blur their indifferent performance in achieving the original mission of the community college--to extend universal education to the first two years of college and to enable the "new" students to move upwardly on the socio-economic ladder. More cynical are the critics who assert that "educators see lifelong learning as a guarantee of lifelong employment" (State Planning for Lifelong

Learning, 1977, p. 8). When one hears a state official remark, "If we have to crack heads to get the public the service it needs, so be it" (State Planning for Lifelong Learning, 1977, p. 8) others wonder how real is the demand of the public for some of the services. Actually, not much "is known about public needs and wants for lifelong learning" (State Planning for Lifelong Learning, 1977, p. 7).

Associated with this are the negative reactions to the assertion that community education has the potential for solving or helping to solve community problems. Talbott observed that the college is confusing its ability to "take [on] the whole community as its province" with taking on "all of the community's problems and expecting[ing] to solve them." She also notes that: "To take on the role of an omniscient social welfare agency strains the credibility as well as the resources of the college. It is not set up to revamp the courts, to change the traffic patterns, to purify the water, to clean the air of smog" (Talbott, 1976, p. 89). Educators do not see the incongruity of claiming to have answers to the community's problems and their inability to solve their own problems.

Although there is merit in the criticisms leveled at the shortcomings of the educators, they overlook the important roles the state and federal governments are playing in the expansion of the functions of higher educations at all levels. Unfortunately, community college educators do not have the freedom or autonomy that four-year colleges and, to a greater extent, university educators have in shaping their curriculum offerings. Clark in his Open Door College noted;

> "Along a continuum of organizational power in environmental relations, ranging from organization that dominates its environmental relations to one completely dominated by its environment, the public junior college tends strongly toward the latter extreme" (Clark, 1960, p. 175).

Even granting that much of state and federal legislation in this area of community education is enacted as a result of lobbying

efforts of educational organizations, for a variety of reasons--larger tax base, greater state funding, ability to shift part or all of the cost to students and participants--states are transferring responsibility for the major activities comprising community education from the public school to the community college. This is not a new process; it began with the transfer of technical and vocational functions and in some states, all of the vocational schools. In Los Angeles, two technical schools, Frank Wiggins Trade School and Metropolitan Business School, became Trade-Technical College and Metropolitan College of Business respectively. Recently, all the manpower development programs and adult education programs were brought under the control of the Chicago City College system, in below-college-level Urban Skills Institute. This movement will not be reversed. By the end of the 1980s, most of adult education and adult basic education will become the responsibility of the community college by state action. Illustrating this shift is the Iowa example cited above. Florida is in the process of achieving the same end. "State governments," wrote McNeil, then director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, "have discovered lifelong learning. In almost every state, this new concern is reflected in studies, laws, and enlarged budgets to understand and attend to the needs of that huge segment of the population--adults--not now served by postsecondary education institutions" (McNeil, 1977, p. 21). In nearly every state community colleges have been given partial or sole jurisdiction over adult education and adult basic education. It is not farfetched to predict that both these functions will be transferred from the secondary schools to the community college in all states by the end of the century. By then the dilemma of offering below-college-level courses in an institution of higher education may become even more troublesome, for the enrollments and participants in these courses may well be several times as large as the combined occupational and transfer enrollments.

The dilemma, discussed in 1964, remains: how to reconcile so

many below-college-level activities in this group with the desire to maintain the higher education association. Gleazer, Pifer, and others would resolve the dilemma by deemphasizing the collegiate character of the institution, but the overwhelming sentiment among community college educators is opposed to such a change. They, along with concerned legislators, want to maintain the association with higher education.

The dilemma of offering below-college-courses in an institution of higher education may be resolved by offering such courses in an extension division. This solution, borrowed from the four-year college and university, will enable the college to maintain its higher education status and at the same time fulfill its obligation to the community through other activities. The other alternative, transforming the college into a new non-college type of institution, is a remote possibility except for the multicampus districts that have the option of following the lead of the City Colleges of Chicago which placed all of its below-college-level postsecondary education in a separate institution (Chicago City Colleges, 1976). More likely for at least the next five to ten years is the continuance of the present system with a public posture toward emphasis on community education and an internal emphasis on the traditional. So far there has been little evidence to suggest that the local or state public officials have any intention of changing the collegiate character of the community colleges. In fact, the opposite is the case if we may judge by the priorities established in the allocation of funds during crises such as occurred in New York City (Alfred and Others, 1977) and in 1978, confronting California as a result of the passage of the Jarvis-Gann initiative to reduce property taxes. In both instances occupational and transfer credit courses have first priority to state and local funds. Community services activities have lowest priority, with the adult education and continuing education in the middle.

Perhaps by the end of the century the definition of college-level may be expanded to include the functions comprising community

education. They are already included in most state laws on community colleges and they are prominently featured in the Education Amendments of 1976 to the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Sec 101, 20, USC 1001). To accomplish this transformation in practice will be no easy matter because of the persistence in labeling courses and programs as non-credit or below college level. How difficult such a change will be is illustrated by the long struggle to gain acceptance of vocational education as a legitimate college function. The problem may be resolved obliquely by labeling them as postsecondary education.

The financial problem will be partially solved by the imposition of tuition and fees. For some services--hobby courses, for example--the total cost will be borne by the students. Costs of some courses will be borne by firms or public institutions through contractual arrangements. Other services such as adult basic education for illiterates and non-English speaking people and special education for the handicapped and for senior citizens will receive state support with no or low fees. And in between will be credit courses in continuing education that are funded in a similar manner as other credit courses, by formula, and by tuition and fees. Whatever the resolution of these problems, it is fairly certain that the third era of the community college will be characterized by wide acceptance of community education as its third major function.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACCTion Consortium 1977-78. Washington, D.C., pamphlet, [1977].

Alfred, R.L., and Others. Enrollment Profile Report: Fall Semester 1976. Brooklyn: New York City Community College, 1977.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1978 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1978.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1977 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1977.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1976 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1976.

Bogue, J.P. The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950.

Bowen, H.R. Investment in Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977.

Brossman, S.W. "California Perspective 1975." New Directions for Community Colleges: Reaching Out Through Community Service, 4 (2): 43-53; Summer 1976.

California Community Colleges. Fiscal Data Abstract 1976-77. Sacramento, Calif.: Office of the Chancellor, Department of General Services, 1978.

California State Coordinating Council for Higher Education. A Consideration of Issues Affecting California Public Junior Colleges. Sacramento, Calif., 1965. 75pp. ED 010 946.

Chicago City Colleges. The Chicago Urban Skills Institute Catalogue, First Draft. Chicago, Ill.: Chicago Urban Skills Institute, 1976.

Clark, B.R. The Open Door College: A Case Study. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.

"Community Colleges Should Have Sole Delivery Responsibility Task Force Says." CCJCA News, 22 (1): 6; October 1976.

Community Education: Final Report. A Position Paper Presented to the State Board for Community College Education. Olympia:

Washington State Board for Community College Education, 1976. 18pp. ED 131 893.

Cutting, R. The Future of Two-Year Colleges in the California System: Emphasis of Financing. Speech presented at the Deans Forum, University of California at Los Angeles, January 24, 1978.

"Enrollment in Continuing Education and Noncredit Adult Programs in 1975-76." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 15 (22): 10; February 13, 1978.

Evans, A.H., Jr. Sources of Funding of Community Services in Public Community and Junior Colleges. Unpublished paper, 1973. 11pp. ED 076 182.

Florida State Department of Education. Report for Florida Community Colleges, 1975-76. Tallahassee, Fla.: Division of Community Junior Colleges, 1977. 167pp. ED 135 430.

"Focus on the Two-Year College." Guidelines presented at a Conference sponsored by the American Association of Junior Colleges and the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley, December 5-6, 1960.

Gleazer, E.J., Jr. Responding to the New Spirit of Learning. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976. 20pp. ED 129 381.

Gleazer, E.J., Jr. "The Two-Year College." College and University Business, 36 (3): 49; March 1964.

Harlacher, E.L. The Community Dimension of the Community College. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Illinois Community College Board. "How is the Community College Credit Hour Funding Formula Calculated?" Community College Bulletin, 12 (7): 5; March-April 1978a.

Illinois Community College Board. "Public Community Colleges in Illinois." Community College Bulletin, 12 (5): 3; January 1978b.

Illinois Community College Board. "Selected Data of Illinois Public Community Colleges." Community College Bulletin, 12 (5): 3; January 1978c.

Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. Opportunities in Iowa's Area Schools, 1976-77. Des Moines, Iowa, [1976]. 119pp. ED 138 323.

Keim, W.A. "A Dynamic Definition of Service." New Directions for Community Colleges: Reaching Out Through Community Service, 4 (2): 1-10; Summer 1976.

Knoell, D., and Others. Through the Open Door; A Study of Patterns of Enrollment and Performance in California's Community Colleges. Report 76-1. Sacramento: California State Postsecondary Education Commission, 1976. 82pp. ED 119 752.

Lombardi, J. "Emergent Issues in Junior College Administration." In F.T. Giles (Ed.), Emergent Issues in Community College Administration in Our Changing Society. Seattle: University of Washington, 1964.

McNeil, D.R. "State Planning for Adult Learners." In State Planning for Lifelong Learning: Improving Access for All Citizens. A report of a National Invitational Conference, Orlando, Fla., February 20-22, 1977.

Merson, T.B. "The Junior College: Today's Goals, Tommorrow's Aspirations." In W. Ogilvie and M. Raines (Eds.), Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, 1971.

Oregon State Department of Education. Community College Statistical and Enrollment Tables. Salem, Ore.: Community College Division, 1977.

Owen, H.J., Jr. Balancing State and Local Control in Florida's Community Colleges. Unpublished paper, 1978.

Roed, W. State Funding of Community College Community Services Noncredit Offerings: Current Patterns and Problems. Unpublished paper, [1976]. 13pp. ED 133 008.

Schweinberger, O.W. A Report on the Proceedings of the Regional Conference on the Community in the Community College and a Comparison of Participant's Responses Concerning, Their

Perceptions of the Importance of Community Needs and Philosophy in Relation to the Community in the Community College. Moline, Ill.: Black Hawk College, 1977. 101pp. ED 148 453.

Solomon, R.B. A Different Drummer: The CCC (Creative, Comprehensive, Community) College. Atlanta, Ga.: Life-Long Learning Library, 1976.

State Planning for Lifelong Learning: Improving Access for All Citizens. A report of a National Invitational Conference, Orlando, Fla., February 20-22, 1977.

Talbott, L.H. "Community Problem-Solving." New Directions for Community Colleges: Reaching Out Through Community Service, 4 (2): 83-91; Summer 1976.

Title I--Higher Education. Part A--Community Services and Continuing Education. Public Law 94-482, 1976.

Wade, G.H., and Others. Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1975. Summary Report. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1977. 250pp. ED 144 451 (Available in microfiche only).

Watkins, B.T. "California Battle Looms over Control of Community Colleges." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 15 (20): 1,10; January 30, 1978a.

Watkins, B.T. "California Community Colleges Brace for Cuts in Local Revenue." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 16 (14): 10; May 30, 1978b.

Welch, T. "Cabrillo Serves an Exceptional Town." New Directions for Community Colleges: Reaching Out Through Community Service, 4 (2): 37-42; Summer 1976.

Yarrington, R. "Finding the Funds." New Directions for Community Colleges: Reaching Out Through Community Service, 4 (2): 19-27; Summer 1976.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 25 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES